

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-04688-RS


**ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION
IN LIMINE NO. 15**

Defendant moves *in limine* to preclude Plaintiffs from introducing evidence, demonstratives, or argument featuring unjust enrichment opinions that Google contends Plaintiffs' expert buried in a footnote of a supplemental report. *See* Dkt. No. 613. Plaintiffs respond that the opinions result, not from new methods, but rather from the reality that Defendant's financial disclosures leave open to estimation certain details about the later years of the class period.

The motion is granted in part and denied in part. It is granted such that Plaintiffs must amend their demonstratives, evidence, and argument to reflect Lasinski's actual conclusion in his report, which was a range from \$1.498 billion to \$1.726 billion. Any reference to his footnote and disputed supplemental schedules must identify them as merely alternative calculations that rest on his own assumptions about costs for the latter years of the class period.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

1 Dated: August 22, 2025

2 
3 RICHARD SEEBORG
4 Chief United States District Judge

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California